



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/788,813

02/27/2004

David W. Proctor

MSFT-2872/306077.02

7349

41505

7590

04/15/2009

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

KUMAR, ANIL N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on December 19th, 2008.

Claims (1-5, 8-17, 20-28 and 31-41) are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-17, 20-28 and 31-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadesky et al. ("Zadesky", US 2003/0076306 A1) in view of Ludtke (US 2001/0043198 A1).

Claim 1: Zadesky teach, a user interface control including, comprising:

- a touchpad control having a touch-sensitive surface comprising the shape of an arc (The shape of the touch pad 110 may also be widely varied, paragraph [0044] and Fig. 2), the arc divided into a first region and a second region by a dividing boundary (the touch pad provides more range -regions- of finger positions – for example, first region 138 is used for horizontal scrolling and second region 136 is used for vertical scrolling-, paragraph [0068] and Fig. 3C), the first region associated with a first function having a plurality of

Art Unit: 2174

different degrees of said first function (the user can manipulate the his or her finger side to side for horizontal scrolling –first function, and the degree depends on the position where the user touches his finger to start scrolling-, paragraph [0068] and Fig. 3C), and the second region associated with a second function having a plurality of different degrees of said second function (the user can manipulate his or her finger backwards and forwards for vertical scrolling, –second function, and the degree depends on the position where the user touches his finger to start scrolling-, paragraph [0068] and Fig. 3C), the second function being an opposite function of the first function(the horizontal scrolling is opposite to the vertical scrolling, paragraph [0068] and Fig. 3C), wherein the touchpad control is configured to detect a touch within the first region or the second region, and to select the first function and an associated degree of the first function, and to select the second function and an associated degree of the second function (control assembly 212, paragraph [0053-54] and Fig. 4),

but does not explicitly disclose,

- corresponding to the relative distance of the touch from the dividing boundary upon detecting the touch in the first/second region

However, Ludtke teach, a method and system for selecting a location of a graphic to choose a value from the range (Abstract) and further teach, calculating a degree/value of the function based on the distance from a boundary (the candidate value would be chosen so that the position of the candidate value

within range 72 is proportional to the distance of pointer 12 from ends 30, paragraph [0057]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Ludtke's teaching with Zadesky, to include the relative distance feature in Zadesky, in order to make the features that depend on degrees of functionality, easy and efficient to use in a touchpad environment.

Claim 2: Zadesky teach, wherein the arc is of substantially uniform width (Fig. 2).

Claim 3: Zadesky teach, wherein the touchpad control is substantially in the shape of a quarter circle (The shape of the touch pad 110 may also be widely varied, paragraph [0044] and Fig. 2).

Claim 4: Zadesky teach, wherein the arc is at least one of (A) thinner than at least one end of the arc at the middle of the arc and (B) thicker than at least one end of the arc at the middle of the arc and the arc includes at least one of (C) a curved end and (D) a substantially straight end (The shape of the touch pad 110 may also be widely varied, paragraph [0044] and Fig. 2).

Claim 5: Zadesky teach, wherein the dividing boundary between said first region and said second region is substantially about the middle of the arc (The position of the buttons 112 relative to the touch pad 110 may be widely varied, paragraph [0045]).

Claim 8: Zadesky teach, wherein at least one of said first function and second function includes varying degrees of function for at least one of Escape, Start, Options, More, Less OK, Back, Forward, Play, Pause, Up, Down, Fast Forward, Reverse, Skip Forward, Skip Backwards, Menu, Left, Right, Mute, Volume Up, Volume Down, Raise Light and Lower Light functionalities (By way of example, the plurality of buttons 112 may consist of a menu button, play/stop button, forward seek button and a reverse seek button, and the like, paragraph [0045]).

Claim 9: Ludtke further teach, wherein the degree of functionality is determined based upon a distance of an input in said first region of control from the centerline of the touch pad arc (the candidate value would be chosen so that the position of the candidate value within range 72 is proportional to the distance of pointer 12 from ends 30 –dividing boundary-, paragraph [0057]).

Claim 10: Zadesky teach, wherein the degree of functionality is determined based upon a distance of an input in said first region of control from the centerline of the touch pad arc; is determined based upon at least one of (A) a velocity and (B) an acceleration associated with an, input to the user interface control calculated from recent historical interaction with the user interface control (since the list of media items can be rather lengthy, the invention provides the ability for the user to rapidly –inherent that the velocity and/or acceleration is

Art Unit: 2174

determined- traverse (or scroll) through the list of media items, paragraph [0040]).

Claim 11: Zadesky teach, wherein said arc is substantially in the form of a curved cavity in the surface of a device including the user interface control (Fig. 2).

Claim12: Zadesky teach, implemental in any of a portable media player, a remote control for a computing device, a computing device, a swappable component of a computing device and a component for augmenting a computing device (There exist today many styles of input devices for performing operations in a consumer electronic device, paragraph [0007]).

Claim 13 is similar in scope claim 1, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Furthermore, Zadesky teach, that the touch pad may be widely varied (paragraph [0036]).

Claim 14 is similar in scope claim 2, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope claim 3, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 16 is similar in scope claim 4, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope claim 5, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope claim 8, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope claim 9, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope claim 10, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope claim 12, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope claim 1, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Furthermore, Zadesky teach, receiving a touch input, determining the location and outputting a function call (touchpad/display system 200, paragraph [0051]) and Fig. 4).

Claim 25: Zadesky teach, performing the first function functionality to the corresponding degree upon receipt of said at least one of at least one function call and at least one signal (The touch pad 110 is configured to provide one or more control functions, paragraph [0036]).

Claim 26: Ludtke further teach, wherein said first/second region location determining step includes determining a distance of the touch input within the first region from the dividing boundary of the touchpad control (the candidate value would be chosen so that the position of the candidate value within range 72 is proportional to the distance of pointer 12 from ends 30 –dividing boundary-, paragraph [0057]). Motivation to combine Ludtke with Zadesky is the same as in claim 1.

Claim 27 is similar in scope claim 10, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope claim 5, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 31 is similar in scope claim 8, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 32 is similar in scope claim 24, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Furthermore, Zadesky teach, computer readable medium (paragraph [0066]).

Claim 33 is similar in scope claim 24, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Furthermore, Zadesky teach, processor 214 is coupled between the control assembly 212 and the display screen 204 (paragraph [0054]).

Claim 34 is similar in scope claim 24, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Furthermore, Zadesky teach, a detection component (control assembly 212) and an output component (processor 214 is coupled to the display screen 204, paragraph [0054] and Fig. 4).

Claim 35 is similar in combination to claims 1 and 13, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope claim 34, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Zadesky teach, a processing subunit (processor 214, Fig. 4).

Claim 37 is similar in scope claim 35, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 38 is similar in combination to claims 1 and 13, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Zadesky teach, a computing device (processor 214, Fig. 4).

Claim 39 is similar in scope claim 9, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 40 is similar in scope claim 26, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41 is similar in scope claim 10, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on December 19th, 2008 have been fully considered but they were found not persuasive.

A. Applicant argues, "Zadesky does not disclose "a touch-sensitive surface comprising the shape of an arc, the arc divided into a first region and a second

Art Unit: 2174

region by a dividing boundary". The Examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains that Zadesky, clearly teach 2 touch-sensitive surfaces (110, and 112 in Fig. 2). Please see the claim rejection for details.

- B. Applicant argues, "Zadesky also does not teach or suggest "the first region associated with a first function..., and the second region associated with a second function..., the second function being an opposite function of the first function". The Examiner respectfully disagrees maintains the rejection and points out that Zadesky clearly teach, two different and opposite functions such as swirl/scroll and stop in two different regions. Please see the claim rejection for details.
- C. Applicant argues, "As noted, in Ludtke, there is no "first region" and "second region" and there is no "associated first function" and "second function." Moreover, in Ludtke, the relative data values are calculated so that the position of the value within the range 72 of potential values is proportional to the distance of the slider pointer 12 from the ends 30, 31 of the bar, (Ludtke at ¶ [0033]) and not the "relative distance" "from a dividing boundary" that divides the slider "into a first region and a second region."". The Examiner respectfully disagrees maintains the rejection and points out that Ludtke reference is only used to point out the obviousness assigning a value/degree to a functionality based on a

"distance computed from a boundary" of the claimed novelty only. Please see the claim rejection for details.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil N. Kumar whose telephone number is (571) 270-1693. The examiner can normally be reached on Wednesdays and alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri EST (Alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri off).

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANK
4/10/2009

/Joshua D Campbell/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178